

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed December 9, 2008.

Claims 1, 11, 20, 28 and 35 recite the limitation “the console extension”. The examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 1, 11, 20, 28 and 35 have been amended to avoid this problem.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-19, 20, 22-27, 28, 30-34, 35 and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Wiegel (US Patent No. 6,484,261).

Claims 4, 14, 21, 29 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel, in view of Zellweger (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,222).

Claims 1, 11, 20, 28 and 35 have been amended to add the feature that “nodes in the tree are associated with MBean objects and the tree is updated by associating a user extension with one of the MBean objects; and wherein the tree node where a user can access the console extension is a child of the node of the one of the MBean objects”. This feature is not shown or made obvious by the cited prior art. This feature is supported by paragraph [0035] of the present invention’s published application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 9, 2009

By: /Joseph P. O’Malley/
Joseph P. O’Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800